	Case 2:23-cv-00837-WBS-CKD Docume	ent 5 Filed 06/27/23 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	J.M. VELASQUEZ-RINCON,	No. 2:23-cv-0837 CKD P
12	Petitioner,	
13	V.	ORDER AND
14	WARDEN, F.C.I HERLONG,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	On May 10, 2023, petitioner was ordered to file an in forma pauperis affidavit or to pay	
18	the appropriate filing fee, within thirty days, and warned that failure to comply would result in a	
19	recommendation that his petition be dismissed. The thirty-day period has now expired, and	
20	petitioner has not responded to the court's order, has not filed an in forma pauperis affidavit, and	
21	has not paid the appropriate filing fee.	
22	Accordingly, IIT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court assign a district	
23	court judge to this case; and	
24	IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice.	
25	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to	
26	the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days after being	
27	served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the	
28	court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to	
		1

Case 2:23-cv-00837-WBS-CKD Document 5 Filed 06/27/23 Page 2 of 2

1	Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." In his objections petitioner may address	
2	whether a certificate of appealability should issue in the event he files an appeal of the judgment	
3	in this case. See Rule 11, Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases (the district court must	
4	issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant).	
5	Where, as here, a habeas petition is dismissed on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability	
6	"should issue if the prisoner can show: (1) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether	
7	the district court was correct in its procedural ruling;' and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it	
8	debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right." Morris	
9	v. Woodford, 229 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484	
10	(2000)). Any response to the objections shall be served and filed within fourteen days after	
11	service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the	
12	specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951	
13	F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).	
14	Dated: June 27, 2023 Carola U. Delany	
15	CAROLYN K. DELANEY	
16	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
17		
18		
19	1/kly	
20	vela0837.fpt.hab	
21		
22		
23		
24		